ISSDS Enterprise Workgroups

Data Sharing

Project Name: **Enterprise Workgroups**

Prepared By: Data Sharing Enterprise Workgroup
Sandy Wiseman and Art Ritter (Co-Chairs)

Date Document Prepared: **October 9, 2006**

Table of Contents

Revision History

Deliverables Document: Version History			
Revision	Date	Description	Name
V1.0	October 9, 2006	Original Version	Committee
V1.1	December 15, 2006	After Revisions	Co-Chairs
V1.2	December 18, 2006	Final Version	Co-Chairs

Approvals

Deliverables Document: Approval Table			
Approved By	Date	Position	Signature

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Overview

The purpose set out for the Data Sharing Workgroup: to study issues and make recommendations regarding local and partner access to data on VDSS systems. Access needs to be timely, consistent with security and legal restrictions and presented in a standard format usable by Local Departments of Social Services.

Therefore, the Data Sharing Workgroup began to explore the who, what, where, and when: of providing local and partner agencies access to appropriate data on VDSS systems in a manner consistent within security and legal restrictions; developing standard approaches for sharing data; identifying data exchange requirements and priorities for localities; and categorizing current system interfaces for the purposes of sharing data.

2. Acronyms

The following acronyms may be found within this document.

ASAPS	Adult Services Adult Protective Services
BPR	Business Process Re-engineering
DOE	Department of Education
ISSDS	Integrated Social Services Delivery System
LDAP	Lightweight Directory Access Protocol
LDSS	Local Departments of Social Services
SPIDeR	Systems Partnering in a Demographic Repository
VDSS	Virginia Department of Social Services

3. Issues

3.1 Issues/Business Needs

1. Improved data sharing among VDSS, LDSS, and partner agencies;

2. Central repository for common data sharing (with demographic data the first element to be considered) to have a system of record;

3. Global system with simplified sign-on that would access all applications, both state and local;

4. Application that will merge/link client and provider data from the various systems; technology that can reconcile various system identification numbers for the same facility needs;

5. Data ownership; this would including defining which system owns which data that might be shared and who would be able to make any changes in this data;

6. Secure data-sharing in compliance with state policies and security standards; and

7. Common definitions and standardized format for data exchange. This would include a shared data schema for shared data.

3.2 Background

The Data Sharing Workgroup defined data sharing as data going from one system to another through an interface, focusing on system-to-system data sharing. The workgroup's endeavor was prompted by: inconsistency in agency data; difficulty finding needed data; and incomplete, untimely or missing management reports and a need to simplify for the worker how they log into the various systems. Also, the desire for: no dual entry; linking systems together for reporting; uploading data from state systems; and accessing raw data from state systems to run reports.

The workgroup asked these questions:

1. What data needs to be shared?
2. How do we need to share data?
3. What data is currently being shared?
4. What needs to be done with shared data?
5. What data do LDSS want to see from VDSS?
6. What data do LDSS want to see from other LDSS?
7. Why can't LDSS currently see each others' data (keeping in mind that local agencies have different requirements and data)?

Then began approaching the questions by asking:

1. What data is shared with LDSS, VDSS, and other State Agencies?
2. How is data shared?
3. Who is data shared with?
4. How often is data shared?
5. What do others want to share from your system?
6. What other systems do you want to share data with?

See 6. Attachments (Visio files)

3.3 Justification

Improve business productivity; develop a standard approach for sharing data between local and state systems; create a common place for data to be shared by systems and for reporting to reduce inconsistency in data being provided; reduce dual data entry by workers; allow agencies access to data found in state systems needed to prevent duplication of services; reduce security risk and inefficiencies caused by having multiple sign ons and improve coordination of services for consumers.

4. Analysis of Alternatives/Solutions

4.1 Recommendations (corresponding to 3.1 Issues/Business Needs)

1. **Improved data sharing** among VDSS, LDSS, and partner agencies and by doing so minimizing dual entry and improving the accuracy and integrity of data. Our short term goal would be to increase the ability of SPIDeR to populate other applications in a similar way as it is able to do to ASAPS. As a long term goal, it is to be able to import data other than just demographic. Some issues to be decided would include defining what data would be in this central repository, and also who has the ability to change the particular data in the repository.

2. **Central location** for common data sharing (with demographic data the first element to be considered) to become the system of record. This would create a common repository and standards for data sharing, so agencies will be able to more effectively coordinate services for consumers, better meet the needs of our consumers, improve efficiency of services provided to consumers, and prevent duplication of services. As a short term goal, we could use the demographic data in SPIDeR. As a long term goal we could increase the demographic (and/or other data) that is contained in this central location. This could be an enhancement of SPIDeR, or a SPIDeR-like technology, as the method for local agencies to retrieve client data entered into state systems. The enhanced SPIDeR, or SPIDeR-like technology, becomes the location or central repository for common data sharing (considering demographic data first). The issues involved in this would be clearly defining the data elements, clarifying who has the ability to update the specific data elements and clarifying the rules regarding the systems of records. The DSS Data Warehouse should be enhanced to consolidate client demographic attributes so that information about each client can be applied across data marts for analysis purposes. Note: this work, known as “Integrating clients across data marts”, has been established as a high priority for 2007 by the Business Intelligence Steering Committee.

3. Work to establish a **global system, simplified sign-on** that would access all applications, both state and local, for the purposes of sharing data and eliminating the additional keying of like information. A short term goal might be to simplify so that the password rules are consistent across applications and can be changed at a single time or place (such as using LDAP). A long term goal would be to have one portal that the person would log on that would then give access to all appropriate applications that would not require a separate sign it to get into the application. It is understood that local applications would be a separate issue.

4. LDSS and VDSS have independent systems to capture client expenditures and provider-related data. With the ever growing requirements by the Federal Government and state policies to account for client-related expenditures, there is a need to develop an **application that will merge/link client and provider data** from all the various systems. Technology that can reconcile various system identification numbers for the same facility need to be developed, as the data must be linked to the client data so that client expenditures and provider payments can be tracked across different localities.

   Example #1: Child A in City 1 (information in one local system) is receiving services from Licensed Facility #1 (data located in a VDSS system) and so is Child B in City 2 (information located in a different local system).

   Example #2: Child A is receiving services from Licensed Facility #1 (data located in a VDSS system), mental health services from facility #Q (information in one local system), and educational service from a DOE licensed facility (data from a VDSS system).

   As a long term goal, we might be to explore the need for a single application to define and manage provider data.

5. Identify **data ownership**. Currently, similar and/or identical data is entered into a variety of applications.. In order to share data there are various policy and technical rules that would need to be developed or modified to define who can update data that would then be shared between applications. Other issues would include defining system of record and working with any definitions tied to funding sources. This would be critical in moving towards a central location for Demographic data.

6. Comply with **security** for data sharing as indicated by state policies and security standards. Data should be shared with the individuals/agencies that need the data for their particular job duties.

7. Work with locals to develop **common definitions and standardized format** for data exchange. The use of open standards would be preferred where possible so that the same process can be used between multiple agencies and/or applications and not have to be individually written for each interchange.

4.2 Identification of Alternatives

Expand upon SPIDeR, or SPIDeR-like technology, as a possible system of record for sharing client data between state and local systems. This complies with the Goal 3 Committee/BPR direction of improving business productivity through effective automation by reducing dual data entry into multiple systems, therefore improving productivity.

5. Conclusions

The Data Sharing Workgroup began meeting in May 2006 and continued through November 2006 under the guidance of the Integrated Social Services Delivery System group. The sessions included meetings, conference calls, presentations and demonstrations that were used to analyze the above-stated issues and business needs, which in turn allowed us to make the following seven recommendations:

- Improve data sharing among VDSS, LDSS and partner agencies.
- Create a central location for common data sharing.
- Work to establish a global, system-wide simplified sign-on.
- Develop an application to merge client and provider data.
- Identify data ownership.
- Comply with security regulations for data sharing.
- Develop common definitions and standardized formats.

The above recommendations are offered to improve business productivity and develop a standard approach for sharing data between local and state systems. Creating a common place for data to be shared by systems and for reporting will:

- reduce inconsistency in data.
- reduce dual data entry by workers.
- allow agencies access to data needed to prevent duplication of services, which will therefore improve coordination of services to consumers.

6. Attachments

Visio files